




Steven L. Beshear
Governor

TRANSPORTATION CABINET
Frankfort, Kentucky 40622
www.transportation.ky.gov/

Michael W. Hancock, P.E.
Acting Secretary

DESIGN MEMORANDUM NO. 02-10

TO: Chief District Engineers
Design Engineers
Active Consultants

FROM: Jeff D. Jasper, P.E. 
Director
Division of Highway Design

DATE: May 28, 2010

SUBJECT: Implementation of Revised Consultant Evaluation Process

In the winter of 2009, a committee was created to develop an improved consultant evaluation process. The committee consisted of 6 members, 3 being KYTC project managers and 3 leaders from the consultant industry. The goal of the committee was to create an evaluation process that would capture relevant, beneficial information; provide accurate ratings with little subjectivity; and be user friendly. It was determined that the evaluation process should correspond to work flow and allow a dialog between the KYTC project manager and the consultant on issues of expectations and accountability. The committee also defined the evaluation process as a means to monitor performance, provide timely feedback and create a history of performance.

In order for the evaluation process to provide timely feedback and capture relevant and accurate information, an evaluation will be performed at critical milestones during the project development process and pertain to highway design tasks and activities required to reach that milestone. The milestones selected to trigger an evaluation is Preliminary Line and Grade Inspection, Joint Inspection and Project Letting. These evaluations are called Phase I Evaluation, Phase II Evaluation and Contract Plans Evaluation, respectively. The Phase I Evaluation is to be submitted with the Preliminary Line and Grade minutes when the preferred alternative is selected. The Phase II Evaluation is to be submitted with the Joint Inspection minutes. The Contract Plans Evaluation is to be submitted when the project is let to contract. The evaluations are to be performed by the District Project Manager and the Central Office Location Engineer independently. The Phase I Evaluation addresses the conceptual design and development of a best solution, the Phase II Evaluation pertains to creating the greatest benefit from the preferred



An Equal Opportunity Employer M/F/D

alternate and the Contract Plans Evaluation relates to effectively and accurately conveying the details of the project in a plan set.

Each evaluation is comprised of two categories, Project Management and Project Development. Project Management deals with items related to professionalism and knowledge. Project Development corresponds to items of work and activities required to produce a product.

Appropriate and timely monitoring of key items within critical milestones will help insure that both the evaluator and consultant are paying attention to fundamental expectations and conducting work in an effective and efficient manner. This improved evaluation process will hopefully achieve our goals and ultimately provide a better product.

The evaluation forms, definitions of the items to be evaluated and instructions on how to complete the form is located in the Highway Design webpage located on the Intranet. After each evaluation is completed, it is automatically saved to a library for storage. The evaluator is to print the one page evaluation summary to PDF and place it in the corresponding project ProjectWise folder. The evaluator is to submit the evaluation summary sheet to the TEBM of Design in Central Office by e-mail and copy their respective project manager or location engineer. Both the project manager and location engineer evaluations will be placed in a formal package by Central Office Design and be distributed to the Consultant with the project manager and Professional Services copied.

With this memo, the implementation of the improved evaluation process is effective immediately. Project Development Branch Managers should submit names of the evaluators to Jennifer Gatewood Jennifer.gatewood@ky.gov so they can be given access to the forms and library. Attached are the evaluation forms and summary sheets for your review.

JDJ/CTA

Attachments

PHASE I CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Consultant Name	<input type="text"/>	County	<input type="text"/>
* asterisks denotes DBE certified			
Address	<input type="text"/>	Road Name/Route	<input type="text"/>
City, State, Zip	<input type="text"/>	Item No.	1 <input type="text"/>
Vendor No	<input type="text"/>	District	<input type="text"/>

CONTRACT DATA

Contract Number	<input type="text"/>	Type of Work	<input type="text"/>	Type of Funding	<input type="text"/>
				Description of Funding	<input type="text"/>
Original Contract Amount	<input type="text"/>	Notice to Proceed Date	<input type="text"/>	Number of Contract Mods	<input type="text"/>
Current Total Contract	<input type="text"/>	PL&G Date	<input type="text"/>		

RATINGS

	5	4	3	2	1	
--	---	---	---	---	---	--

Project Management

	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Project Knowledge	Aware of all major and minor project objectives and obstacles. Aware of KYTC policy and procedures.	Aware of most key issues concerning the project. Some KYTC guidance required.	Adequately aware of project objectives and /or adequate knowledge of KYTC policy.	Not very familiar with project goals and issues. Frequent KYTC guidance required.	Unaware of project objectives and issues. Heavy KYTC guidance required	

	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Communication	Correspondence was professional, polite and clear and all requests quickly resolved.	Correspondence was good and most requests quickly resolved.	Adequate correspondence and/or responsiveness.	Correspondence was unclear and inaccurate. Seldom replied in timely manner.	Correspondence was confusing and misleading. Long delays in meeting requests.	

	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Leadership/Resources	Knowledgeable and experienced staff that was well equipped. Great direction in resolving issues.	Good staff that was sufficiently equipped with good direction. Could resolve most issues.	Staff was adequate with some difficulty in resolving issues.	Staff was lacking in experience. Little guidance given to staff to resolve issues.	Unable to adequately supply personnel and equipment needed. Obstacles were seldom resolved.	

	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Flexibility/Schedule	Willing and capable of adapting to changing project parameters and meet deadlines on time.	Little resistance to adapting to evolving project issues with minor issues with deadlines.	Adequately able to change with project evolution and/or some issues with meeting deadlines.	Not very good at adapting to changes in the project and seldom made deadlines.	Not agile or willing to accommodate changing project constraints and habitually late on deadlines.	

	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Project Approach	Work plan was defined with innovative solutions that were appropriate to project constraints. Very Efficient.	Good organization with minor items overlooked and most solutions adhered to project scope.	Work plan was adequate and solutions addressed purpose and need.	Work plan was off and some wasted effort. Solutions did not adhere to scope and address purpose and need.	Work flow was in disarray. Solutions did not provide for project objectives.	

Project Development

	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
--	----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------	------------------------------

Existing Data	Accurate and complete.	Few items omitted or inaccurate.	Adequate.	Several items not located or inaccurate.	Had no confidence in existing data.	
	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Preliminary Engineering	Provided thorough and innovative alternatives that provided for excellent discussion and appropriate decision.	Alternates addressed most project concerns and design was within standards and practical.	Adequate.	Alternates varied from purpose and need and design was not to minimums or practical.	Alternates did not provide for project objectives and geometry created undesirable or unsafe situations.	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Reports/Presentation	Estimates and data were detailed and accurate. Project issues and solutions were conveyed clearly and accurately.	Accurate data with minor omissions. Concerns were recognized; minor issues omitted.	Information was adequate and conveyed in a satisfactory manner.	Information was confusing and not well defined. Issues and solutions not conveyed clearly.	Information was incomplete. Resulted in an uninformed discussion.	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
R/W & Utility Considerations	Alignments were well thought out and modified to minimize R/W and utility impacts, delays and costs.	Alternates avoided major takings and lessened impact to utilities.	R/W impacts were adequately considered and alternates attempted to avoid utilities.	Showed little regard to R/W impacts and utility relocations were seldom considered.	Neglected R/W impacts and utilities were incomplete and little consideration to impacts.	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Environmental Concerns	Strongly considered environmental impacts, expense and avoided added difficulties to project.	Alignments attempted to minimize environmental impacts.	Most environmental concerns and issues addressed.	Showed little regard to environmental impacts.	Neglected environmental impacts and potential expense and delays to the project.	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Drainage	Strongly considered drainage in the design and assessed appropriate size and type of structures.	Good consideration for the drainage in the design. Good assessment of the structures required.	Adequately provided drainage assessment for the design.	Weak assessment of drainage requirements.	Incomplete information concerning drainage aspects of project.	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Public Involvement / Stakeholder Coordination	Worked well with public, local officials and stakeholders. Excellent and well thought out efforts to work with other disciplines involved in developing the project. Productive efforts.	Aware of most public issues and factors concerning the project. Good at dealing with other disciplines involved in developing the project. Helpful efforts.	Adequately worked with public concerns. Moderate efforts concerning other agencies and disciplines involved in developing the project.	Showed little regard for Public Involvement. Had problems working with other disciplines and agencies. Efforts were not very productive.	Neglected public's concerns. No contact with other agencies, KYTC divisions or disciplines impacting the project. Ideas and information not clearly presented to others.	

Comments:

Score of

Total Points Received

Total Points Possible

Reviewer Location:

- ☐ Central Office
☐ District

Project Manager

Name

Title

Signature

Date

chuck.allen

PHASE I CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Consultant Name

* asterisks denotes DBE certified

Address

City, State, Zip

Vendor No

County

Road Name/Route

Item No.

1

District

RATINGS

5

4

3

2

1

Project Management

Project Knowledge ☐ 5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1 ☐ N/A

Communication ☐ 5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1 ☐ N/A

Leadership/Resources ☐ 5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1 ☐ N/A

Flexibility/Schedule ☐ 5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1 ☐ N/A

Project Approach ☐ 5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1 ☐ N/A

Project Development

Existing Data ☐ 5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1 ☐ N/A

Preliminary Engineering ☐ 5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1 ☐ N/A

Reports/Presentation ☐ 5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1 ☐ N/A

R/W & Utility Considerations ☐ 5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1 ☐ N/A

Environmental Concerns ☐ 5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1 ☐ N/A

Drainage ☐ 5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1 ☐ N/A

Public Involvement / Stakeholder Coordination ☐ 5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1 ☐ N/A

Comments:

Score of

Total Points Received

Total Points Possible

Reviewer Location:

☐ Central Office

☐ District

Project Manager

Name

Title

Signature

Date

chuck.allen

PHASE II CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Consultant Name _____

* asterisks denotes DBE certified

Address _____

City, State, Zip _____

Vendor No _____

County _____

Road Name/Route _____

Item No. _____

1 0000.00

District _____

CONTRACT DATA

Contract Number _____

Type of Work _____

Type of Funding _____

Description of
Funding _____

Original Contract
Amount _____

Notice to
Proceed Date _____

Number of
Contract Mods _____

Current Total Contract _____

DES Approval
Date _____

RATINGS

5

4

3

2

1

Project Management

	5	4	3	2	1	
Project Knowledge	Aware of all major and minor project objectives and obstacles. Aware of KYTC Policy and Procedures.	Aware of most key issues concerning the project. Some KYTC guidance required.	Adequately aware of project objectives and/or mediocre knowledge of KYTC policy.	Not very familiar with project goals and issues and frequent KYTC guidance required.	Unaware of project objectives and issues and heavy KYTC guidance required.	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A

	5	4	3	2	1	
Communication	Correspondence was professional, polite and clear and all requests quickly resolved.	Correspondence was good and most requests quickly resolved.	Correspondence and responsiveness was adequate.	Correspondence was unclear and inaccurate and seldom replied in timely manner.	Correspondence was confusing and misleading and long delays in meeting requests.	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A

	5	4	3	2	1	
Leadership/Resources	Knowledgeable and experienced staff that was well equipped and great direction in resolving issues.	Good staff that was sufficiently equipped with good direction resolving most issues.	Staff was mediocre and adequate direction with some delays in resolving issues.	Staff was lacking in experience and little guidance given to staff to resolve issues.	Unable to adequately supply personnel and equipment needed. Obstacles were seldom resolved.	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A

	5	4	3	2	1	
Flexibility/Schedule	Willing and capable of adapting to changing project parameters and meet deadlines on time.	Little resistance to adapting to evolving project issues with minor issues with deadlines.	Adequately able to change with project evolution and/or some issues with meeting deadlines.	Not very good at adapting to changes in the project and seldom made deadlines.	Not agile or willing to accommodate changing project constraints and habitually late on deadlines.	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A

	5	4	3	2	1	
Project Approach	Work plan was defined and thought out. Prepared and efficient.	Good organization with minor items overlooked.	Work plan was adequate.	Work plan was off and some wasted effort. Unprepared and inefficient.	Work flow was in disarray. Not prepared, efficient or effective.	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A

Project Development

	5	4	3	2	1	
Development of Preferred Alternate	Alternate was developed to offer optimum benefit. Design was appropriate, innovative and practical.	Alternate was good and addressed most project objectives.	Adequate.	Little improvement on alternate to offer optimum benefits.	Alternate was not improved upon to produce the best benefit and solution.	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A

	5	4	3	2	1	
Quantities/Summaries	Quantities, estimates and data were detailed and accurate.	Accurate data with minor omissions.	Information was adequate.	Information was confusing and not well defined. Required items and data missing.	Information was incomplete. Did not understand items and data required.	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A

	5	4	3	2	1	
	Design was well	Design avoided major takings and				<input type="checkbox"/> N/A

R/W, Utility and Environmental Considerations	thought out and modified to avoid and minimize R/W, utility and environmental impacts and costs.	delays. Impacts and obstacles with R/W, utilities and environmental was minimized.	R/W, utilities and environmental impacts were adequately considered.	R/W and utility relocations were seldom considered. Environmental impacts were not addressed.	Property owners were needlessly damaged. Utilities were incomplete and Environmental added delays.	
	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Maintenance of Traffic	MOT, construction phasing and facility maintenance was well developed and appropriate R/W acquired.	Good MOT and provided adequate R/W for the project and future maintenance.	Adequate efforts in planning for MOT and future maintenance issues.	Had problems working out MOT within the R/W limits provided.	MOT Created confusing and unsafe conditions. Inadequate R/W limits established.	
	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Drainage Folders/Plans	Accurate and thorough drainage analysis and calculations clearly presented in folder and summarized on plans.	Good analysis of hydraulics and appropriate structures and ditches.	Adequately provided hydraulic analysis and adequately depicted on plans.	Weak drainage report and hydraulic analysis. Contained some errors.	Folder and analysis was inaccurate and incomplete. Plans did not correspond or depict the hydraulic analysis.	
	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Completeness of Plans/Reports/Presentation	Professionally developed with all information accurately included and presented.	Thorough and organized with minor omissions/errors.	Plans and data were adequate.	Plans and data contained errors and did not allow for a good review.	Many errors and incomplete submittal package.	
<div>Comments:</div> <div></div>						
Score of <div></div>		Total Points Received <div></div> Total Points Possible <div></div>				
Reviewer Location:	<input type="checkbox"/> Central Office <input type="checkbox"/> District					
Project Manager	Name chuck.allen	Title <div></div>	Signature _____			Date <div></div>

PHASE II CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Consultant Name
* asterisks denotes DBE certified
Address

City, State, Zip

Vendor No

County

Road Name/Route

Item No.

1 0000.00

District

RATINGS

5

4

3

2

1

Project Management

Project Knowledge ☐ 5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1 ☐ N/A

Communication ☐ 5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1 ☐ N/A

Leadership/Resources ☐ 5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1 ☐ N/A

Flexibility/Schedule ☐ 5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1 ☐ N/A

Project Approach ☐ 5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1 ☐ N/A

Project Development

Development of Preferred Alternate ☐ 5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1 ☐ N/A

Quantities/Summaries ☐ 5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1 ☐ N/A

R/W, Utility and Environmental Considerations ☐ 5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1 ☐ N/A

Maintenance of Traffic ☐ 5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1 ☐ N/A

Drainage Folders/Plans ☐ 5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1 ☐ N/A

Completeness of Plans/Reports/Presentation ☐ 5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1 ☐ N/A

Comments:

Score of

Total Points Received

Total Points Possible

Reviewer Location:

☐ Central Office

☐ District

Project Manager

Name
chuck.allen

Title

Signature

Date

CONTRACT PLANS CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Consultant Name

* asterisks denotes DBE certified

Address

City, State, Zip

Vendor No

County

Road Name/Route

Item No.

1

District

CONTRACT DATA

Contract Number

Type of Work

Type of Funding

Description of Funding

Original Contract Amount

Notice to Proceed Date

Number of Contract Mods

Current Total Contract

R/W Plan Submittal Date

Letting Date

RATINGS

5

4

3

2

1

Project Management

Knowledge of Project Details and Policy

5
All details and project decisions were accurately depicted and conveyed in final plans. Aware of KYTC policy and procedures.

4
Plans incorporated most Project Team decisions and details. Little KYTC guidance required.

3
Plans adequately conveyed project details and decisions. Familiar with KYTC policies.

2
Plans omitted some details and team decisions. Not very familiar with KYTC policy.

1
Major project details and team decisions were not incorporated in plans. Unaware of KYTC policy and procedures.

N/A

Communication

5
Correspondence was professional, polite and clear and all requests quickly resolved.

4
Correspondence was good and most requests quickly resolved.

3
Adequate correspondence and/or responsiveness.

2
Correspondence was unclear and inaccurate and seldom replied in timely manner.

1
Correspondence was confusing and misleading and long delays in meeting requests.

N/A

Leadership/Resources

5
Knowledgeable and experienced staff that was well equipped and great direction in resolving issues.

4
Good staff that was sufficiently equipped with good direction resolving most issues.

3
Staff was adequate with some difficulty in resolving issues.

2
Staff was lacking in experience and little guidance given to staff to resolve issues.

1
Unable to adequately supply personnel and equipment needed. Obstacles were seldom resolved.

N/A

Flexibility/Schedule

5
Willing and capable of adapting to changing project parameters and meet deadlines on time.

4
Little resistance to adapting to evolving project issues with minor issues with deadlines.

3
Adequately able to change with project evolution and some issues with meeting deadlines.

2
Not very good at adapting to changes in the project and seldom made deadlines.

1
Not agile or willing to accommodate changing project constraints and habitually late on deadlines.

N/A

Project Approach

5
Work plan was defined and innovative solutions. Prepared and efficient.

4
Good organization with minor items overlooked.

3
Adequate.

2
Work plan was unprepared and inefficient.

1
Work flow was in disarray. Not organized, efficient or effective.

N/A

Project Development

Plan Quality

5
Plans were professional, well developed and conformed to standards. Minor mark ups on the check plan submittal.

4
Few items omitted or inaccurate. Few mark ups on check plan submittal.

3
Adequate.

2
Some omissions or inaccurate. Check Plans had several mark ups. Bidders had questions.

1
Plans were confusing and difficult to read. Check Plans required work. Bidders with several questions.

N/A

Quantities,

5
Correct use of bid items, specifications

4
Quantities, specs

3

2

1
Specifications not used

N/A

Summaries, Specifications and General Notes	and notes. Quantities accurate and well defined.	and notes needed some minor corrections.	Adequate	Quantities, Specs and Notes had errors and misleading.	correctly. Errors that would lead to Construction change orders.	
	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 Well thought out. Appropriate lane widths and provided adequate space for construction operations.	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 Good at dealing with phasing with little conflicts in MOT and construction activities.	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 Adequate.	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 Plans required some revisions.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 Plans had potential of producing unsafe scenarios and delays during construction	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Maintenance of Traffic/Phasing						
	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 R/W Plans were complete. R/W and utilities were accurately depicted on plans. Deeds were detailed and correct.	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 Few errors in R/W and Utility submittal. The plans and deed descriptions were consistent.	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 Adequate.	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 Some errors with R/W plans and deeds. Utilities were not accurate.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 R/W and Utility plans and data contained several errors and omissions.	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
R/W Plan Submittal						
	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 Complete, thorough, well documented and submitted in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 Revisions were completed with minor errors and little delay.	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 Revisions were adequate.	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 Much time needed to receive revisions and not well documented.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 Revisions were inconsistent and confusing. Long delays.	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
R/W Revisions						
	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 All environmental concerns were noted and incorporated in plans as needed/required.	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 Environmental aspects covered with minor issues overlooked.	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 Some required environmental concerns and issues not addressed in plans.	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 Several environmental obligations not included in plans.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 Neglected environmental obligations required in plans.	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Environmental Concerns/ Permitting - Erosion Control						
	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 Accurate and thorough analysis and calculations summarized clearly in folder. Pipe summaries and sheets were accurate.	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 Folders and plans depicting drainage aspects of project were good with minor errors.	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 Adequate submittal of the final folder and drainage plans.	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 Weak drainage report and plans depicting pipe sheets and summaries had errors.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 Folder and summaries were inaccurate and incomplete.	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Drainage Folder/ Drainage Summaries						
	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 Meets 100% CADD Standards current version	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 Meets 85% CADD Standards current version	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 Meets 65% CADD Standards current version	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 Meets 50% CADD Standards current version	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 CADD Plans incomplete (Resubmittal required)	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Electronic Project Files Delivered						
<div>Comments:</div> <div></div>						
Score of		<div></div>		Total Points Received		<div></div>
				Total Points Possible		<div></div>
Reviewer Location:						
<input type="checkbox"/> Central Office <input type="checkbox"/> District						
Project Manager		Name	Title	Signature	Date	
		chuck.allen	<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>	

CONTRACT PLANS CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Consultant Name
* asterisks denotes DBE certified
Address

City, State, Zip

Vendor No

County

Road Name/Route

Item No.

1
District

RATINGS

5 4 3 2 1

Project Management

Knowledge of Project Details and Policy ☐ 5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1 ☐ N/A

Communication ☐ 5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1 ☐ N/A

Leadership/Resources ☐ 5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1 ☐ N/A

Flexibility/Schedule ☐ 5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1 ☐ N/A

Project Approach ☐ 5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1 ☐ N/A

Project Development

Plan Quality ☐ 5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1 ☐ N/A

Quantities, Summaries, Specifications and General Notes ☐ 5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1 ☐ N/A

Maintenance of Traffic/Phasing ☐ 5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1 ☐ N/A

R/W Plan Submittal ☐ 5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1 ☐ N/A

R/W Revisions ☐ 5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1 ☐ N/A

Environmental Concerns/ Permitting - Erosion Control ☐ 5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1 ☐ N/A

Drainage Folder/ Drainage Summaries ☐ 5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1 ☐ N/A

Electronic Project Files Delivered ☐ 5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1 ☐ N/A

Comments:

Score of

Total Points Received

Total Points Possible

Reviewer Location:

☐ Central Office

☐ District

Name

Title

Signature

Date

Project Manager

chuck.allen